BOUND VOLUME of HUMAN EVENTS for 1960 may be ordered at pre-publication price of $9.50. Regular price $18. Volumes for 1956, 1958 and 1959 at $18. No other years available.

Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVIII, No. 3 January 20, 1961 Section I — News

CUBA: *Heightening crises analysed* .....(33)

GOP: *Nat'l Committee's impotence scored* ....(34)

APPOINTMENTS: *Kennedy picks appeasers* (34)

AGED: *Goldwater's constructive solution* ....(34)

HELLER: *Wants big spend education aid* ....(35)

Capitol Camera: Conservatives on Capitol Hill register thoughtful approval of Barry Goldwater's "Forgotten American" theme; see in it a possibility of rallying the vast majority of people whose interests suffer from pressure groups and "minority blocs." Old conservatives in Congress see nothing in this posture of Goldwater, nor in his recent statements, to justify inferences that the Arizonan's conservatism has "softened." Just a new approach—they say—which may gain him a wider audience.

• *Joseph P. Kennedy, father of JFK, has been doing an effective public relations job for the son among prominent conservative business figures—by personal visits and phone calls. Hence, the attitude noticeable among these circles—"JFK will not be as liberal as expected," "he's fundamentally sound," "don't worry," etc. Pros in the p.r. game in Washington perceive "Father Joe's" pitch, don't think it will prove true; point to the vast number of liberals and left-wingers getting key appointments.*

• In the Republican cloak-rooms, many expressions of hope that Ike, in retirement, will not abandon his role as "Mr Economy," that he will assume leadership of the "balanced budget," "anti-inflation" crusade to which the majority—the Forgotten Americans—can rally. Ike's State of the Union message acclaimed as touchstone of US fiscal policy.

• *Arguments over responsibility for GOP defeat continue: friends of Ike say Nixon "cold shouldered" the President's cooperation early in campaign; friends of Nixon say the VP got no White House cooperation. At the GOP National Committee meeting here last week, one prominent Republican said: "The rank-and-file did well; it was the top of the ticket which lost the race."*

Cuba—What Next? While Capitol Hill regards the breaking of relations with Cuba's Red regime as a step—long overdue—in the right direction, no little worry has appeared as to what our government (under Ike and then under JFK) will do next. Signs point, unfortunately, to further trouble as a result of unsound policies that are in harmony with the erroneous policies which created the trouble all over Latin America in the first place.

These apprehensions are touched off by constant rumors that the State Department and the CIA still plan to play ball with the leftists among Cuban exiles desiring a "government in exile." Many Cuban refugees look with suspicion on the "Frente Revolucionario Democratico," which seems to enjoy a preferred position with US government authorities. Some of its leaders, such as Manuel Varona, discovered rather late that they did not like Castro; they fled to Florida only last year. Varona's history in Cuban politics suggests that he is at least left of center.

But the most vulnerable aspect of the "Democratic Front" is its connection with former Cuban President Prio Socarras. A leftist, he headed such a corrupt and socialistic regime in 1950-51 that, in the second year, it crumbled and fell easily into the hands of Batista. Varona was in Prio's cabinet.

Socarras later supported Castro's rising against Batista. The openly Red character of the Castro government has not disturbed Prio Socarras. Very recently he proclaimed himself (according to an AP dispatch in the Miami *Herald*) an intimate friend of Castro and said he approved exporting the Castro revolution to other countries. He denied that Fidel's followers are Communists—the usual Red line in defense of Castro. Today, exiles in Miami claim that Prio Socarras is closely linked to the Varona "Democratic Front."

On Capitol Hill, members of Congress are asking: Is it true that Allen Dulles, head of the CIA, has passed the word that the US is supporting the "Democratic Front"?

Further concern is evidenced at a new line receiving publicity in much of the US press. The line is: "Social revolutionary conditions" in Cuba—not Castro—caused the revolution, and that these will continue even if Castro is overthrown. Against this thesis is the testimony of US Ambassadors Arthur Gardner and Earl Smith, who told a Senate committee last September that when Castro rebelled in 1956-57, Cuba was enjoying the greatest prosperity in its recent history. Is the new line—it is asked—an alibi in advance for the substitution of a Socialist, non-Communist government in Cuba for the Moscow-dominated Castro regime?

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOP Meeting: Capitol Hill Republicans who had hoped the National Committee meeting last week would cause a shakeup in the main GOP organization express disappointment. So far it appears that there will be no cutting down of that Committee, although it has long been under fire for its large and inefficient operation; no plans are reported for naming a full-time, fully-paid National Chairman—so necessary for a virile, fighting policy; no talk of diverting funds to the Senate and House Campaign Committees, which must go all out to win the vital 1962 congressional elections.

Finally, the Republican National Committee continues to demonstrate little understanding of how to utilize the press, radio and TV.

Many politicos noted the timeliness of a piece by UPI columnist Lyle Wilson on the eve of the GOP meeting. Wilson recalled that the Democrats reorganized in Washington, following their 1928 defeat, by hiring a shrewd, militant Democratic newspaperman—Charles Michelson—who "did a job" on the Republicans. That "job" contributed largely to the defeat of the GOP in 1932. Michelson generated slogans, new ideas, new strategy in the press; he wrote effective speeches and planted them on members of Congress; he delivered his hard sell personally to the working press. The "job" was successful, historic. Today, GOP Committee members seem quite unaware that they need a Charlie Michelson.

Neither do Committee members appear conscious that the GOP desperately needs a morning newspaper in the Nation's Capital. A fighting GOP paper would offset the morning monopoly of the liberal Washington *Post;* would bolster conservatives in Congress; would alter national policy. Without such an organ, conservatives suffer a grave handicap in political action.

Fortunately, Committee members scorned the project for an Advisory Policy Committee reminiscent of the one Paul Butler created in the opposition party and which Democrats in Congress combatted. New York Senator Kenneth Keating, friend of Rocky, is a principal proponent of this scheme, and he is now being dubbed "The Paul Butler of the GOP."

Almost alone, Senator Barry Goldwater seems to have a constructive and militant design for policy under the incoming Democratic Administration. (See "Aged Conference" story in next column for his remarks and proposals at last week's White House conference on problems of senior citizens.)

Appeasement A La Mode: Prominent conservative Republicans have promised hot question sessions for many of Kennedy's appointees when they come up for confirmation. These Senators will inquire not so much about their administrative experience, but about their attitude toward communism. On the latter score, a number of them have displayed a notable softness in the past.

• Chester Bowles, to be Undersecretary of State, advocates a policy that comes close to outright recognition of Red China in an April, 1959 issue of *Foreign Affairs.* He thinks Chiang Kai-shek should relinquish the offshore islands and he favors a scuttling of Asian military alliances designed to meet Red aggression.

• Adlai Stevenson, Kennedy's pick for UN Ambassador, is for recognizing Red China, was critical of the U-2 flights, and in the past called for an end to the draft. (Kennedy has also chosen three law partners of Stevenson for top government jobs. They are George W. Ball, a Stevenson political adviser, who is slated for Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs; W. Willard Wirtz, named as Undersecretary of Labor; and Newton N. Minow, named as chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.)

• Walt Whitman Rostow, Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor, a Kennedy foreign policy adviser destined for a government job, expresses Bowles-like policy ideas in his *An American Policy in Asia.* On page 13 of this book, Rostow urges what he calls "intelligent anti-Communism" by advocating that the United States "sharply reduce its exhortation and pressure for anti-Communist action in Southeast Asia."

• Arthur H. Dean, the AP reports, is regarded as the most likely man to be named Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. Dean is on record before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as favoring Red China recognition. He is also against the Connally Amendment.

• Kennedy's new roving Ambassador, W. Averell Harriman, effusively praised the Yalta agreements as late as 1951. His report to Kennedy on Africa last fall urged aid for the pro-Communist governments of Ghana and Guinea, and he told Kennedy that Guinea's ruler, Sekou Toure, is not a Communist because, said Harriman, "Toure assured me that he was not a Communist." Harriman says Khrushchev's congratulatory message to Kennedy means the Soviet leader "wants to start afresh."

• George Kennan, former Ambassador to Russia, who now has Kennedy's ear and is looking for an appointment, stated in a January 10, 1958 *U.S. News and World Report* interview that he thinks the US should pull its troops out of Europe and neutralize Germany in the hope Russia will pull back its troops.

• McGeorge Bundy, who will serve on the National Security Council as Kennedy's special assistant for national security affairs, is, ironically, an outspoken critic of our internal security program. He was a vigorous opponent of probing subversion in the Federal government and "inclines toward negotiation" with the Soviet Union, says the New York *Post.*

Aged Conference: Held last week on the heels of the opening of the 87th Congress, the White House Conference on Aging turned into a pitched battle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as to what the lawmakers should or should not do about making medical care for the aged compulsory under social security—the medicare system advocated by President-elect Kennedy.

The Kennedy plan was championed by Walter Reuther, AFL-CIO President George Meany, and Reutherite Senator Pat McNamara (D.-Mich.). This group collided head on with the American Medical Association, which supports the Kerr-Mills bill, a measure not tied to social security.

Senator Barry Goldwater offered the conference a positive medical plan as an alternative to the compulsory program. His suggestions to aid senior citizens—"Forgotten Americans"—were:

(1) Further deductions of tax credits available to persons interested in taking care of their families and themselves. (2) Deductions and credits available to church contributors, which would enable these institutions "to build homes for the aged whose children had passed on and who had no other means of support other than dependency on the church." By the same means individual companies, corporations and labor unions could step up activities in the fields of retirement, hospital and medical benefits. (3) Holding the line on inflation. High prices and irresponsible government spending were scored by Goldwater as a special hardship on the aged.

Proponents of the Kennedy plan wailed to the press that they were outnumbered and outgunned at the meetings, largely due to the presence of AMA lobbyists. But it is noted that in addition to McNamara and the labor leaders, two major figures appeared and spoke in favor of the Kennedy plan. They were former HEW Secretary Marion B. Folsom (1955-1958) and former Eisenhower brain trust wonder boy Arthur Larson. Both men were read out of the Administration after Ike, himself, became fed up with their big spending schemes. The appearance of these two, who, it is suspected, were picked by the pro-compulsory medical care forces because of their former ties with Ike's Administration, was given no small credit for the majority of the 2,600 delegates' lending their approval to the Kennedy-backed measure.

Not Merely Gossip: The House Republican Policy Committee has set up a program to counteract anticipated charges that the GOP is making a "negative" record in Congress and wishes only to sabotage the Kennedy program. Next week a series of positive policy statements will be initiated by House Republicans expert in various fields. Defense will be first, followed periodically by positive policy statements on other matters.

• *Reportorial eyes riveted on the Cuba probe by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee—unreleased testimony, it is said, strengthens thesis that subversion inside the government was decisive in creating the "Cuban mess" of our policy.*

• Henry Cabot Lodge, the "also-ran" for the Vice Presidency, now "at liberty," has been making quite a pitch to Republicans along the line of "let's all get behind the new President"—with such emphasis that Republicans conclude he's seeking to win approval from JFK, and perhaps a new diplomatic position under the Democratic Administration.

Heller: The appointment by President-elect Kennedy of University of Minnesota President Walter W. Heller to head his Council of Economic Advisers was not considered by conservatives as an attempt to stress moderation. Heller advocates vastly increased Federal spending.

An example of what Heller wants in one important field—education—was spelled out in the December, 1959 *NEA Journal.* This is the monthly publication of the Federal aid-championing National Education Association. Heller stated that "it is high time that the Federal government assumed its fair share of the burden" of education.

He said that education is rising on the "priority scale" and that local authorities are unable to meet the challenges of the times without Federal assistance.

What he advocated was the Murray-Metcalf Federal aid bill, which would cost an estimated $4.5 billion a year ($87 billion projected over 20 years). He called it "an expression of the genius of our federalism in its ability to achieve national objectives . . . ." It is recalled that the Murray-Metcalf measure, which did not pass, was faced with the threat of Presidential veto. Now such legislation, strongly backed by top adviser Heller and without the threat of a Kennedy veto, stands an excellent chance of passage unless the opposition is awake, united and active.

Social Security: Wilbur J. Cohen, professor of public welfare administration at the University of Michigan, headed the task force recommending that Kennedy enact a health-care for the aged program even more enormous than Kennedy suggested last August. The plan, says Cohen, would cost an initial $1 billion a year, the taxes to be raised through increasing the social security levy by one-fourth of one per cent for worker and employer.

Cohen is an old hand at "public welfare." He participated in the Social Security Act of 1935 and worked on the Social Security Commission with such New Dealers as Arthur J. Altmeyer and Isidore Falk. He was also active in Geneva with the International Labor Organization, which seeks to impose compulsory welfare by international treaty.

While Cohen may be "experienced" in terms of drafting social security plans, it is observed that he is neither an actuary nor a mathematician and therefore has little knowledge of just how much his schemes will cost and how the money for them is to be raised. Many Congressmen, for example, believe that if health care for the aged must come, it should

CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican Congressman from California: "I read HUMAN EVENTS regularly. It presents the conservative point of view (with which I agree in the great majority of instances) admirably."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be financed through social security. That trust fund has spent more money than it has collected in the past three years and at the moment has only $20 billion of government bonds in the kitty while obligations at the present rate of benefits are $360 billion. The trust fund, in short, is committed to pay out $18 for each $1 actually in hand.

Furthermore, while a tax hike of one-fourth of one per cent may seem small, it is recalled that the social security system started out by levying a tax of just one per cent each on the employer and employee, but the tax on them will exceed four per cent by 1966.

Mitchell's Bid: New Jersey Senator Clifford Case has set out to win total control of the Garden State's GOP organization, reports a HUMAN EVENTS correspondent in that state. He has done so by thrusting into the upcoming gubernatorial primary the candidacy of James P. Mitchell, the modern Republican lame duck Secretary of Labor.

Mitchell coyly admits that he will make the race if Case wishes, and the Senator is now trying to talk announced candidates Wayne Dumont and Charles Sandman out of the primary. This means that Mitchell would meet state senator Walter Jones in the Republican primary April 18.

Case is out to get Jones for reasons not known to the general public. The veteran state legislator did not back Case in his primary battle against conservative Robert Morris last spring. Jones' support thus far comes from the powerful leaders of Bergen, Hudson, Passaic, Middlesex and Somerset Counties, few of whom supported Case.

Mitchell's desire for the New Jersey State House has been harbored for at least a year. Mitchell, in fact, let it be known to President-elect Kennedy that he would be willing to stay on as Secretary of Labor for the first several months of the new Administration, so that he could appeal to Democratic and independent voters. Kennedy rebuffed the overture, picked Arthur Goldberg instead.

Human Events Conference: The first annual HUMAN EVENTS Political Action Conference was held in Washington January 6-7. The Washington *Evening Star* reported correctly that it "burst its seams" with enthusiasm.

Two Senators (Barry Goldwater and Strom Thurmond), 11 Representatives and several outstanding newsmen discussed and answered questions on the problems and opportunities facing conservatives in American politics. Conservatives from Alaska and Maine, Florida and California, as well as hundreds of places in between, attended. A reader from Alberta, Canada, was on hand.

Big favorites with those attending were four GOP freshman Congressmen who told how they won their seats from strong, heavily labor-backed Democrats. Their theme was hard work and sticking to conservative principles throughout the campaign. "People admire courage in a candidate more than we realize" was one of their major points.

Senator Goldwater advised conservatives unhappy with the GOP to do something about it by getting busy in party affairs. He said it does no good to throw rocks at the GOP tent because of the liberals inside, that you can only score on them effectively by getting inside the tent yourself and going to work.

Representative Walter Judd was repeatedly applauded for his penetrating analysis of Red aims and America's lag in meeting and understanding the challenge. South Carolina Democrat William Jennings Bryan Dorn assured the conferees that there is a coalition in Congress, and that a conservative bloc is necessary in both parties to maintain governmental balance. Former Montana Democratic Senator Burton K. Wheeler (1924 Progressive party candidate for Vice President when the elder Bob LaFollette ran for President) discussed the inadvisability of third party movements unless those involved are prepared to run candidates at all levels from sheriff on up.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., was a hit with his frank discussion of political problems and personalities, and Willard Edwards of the Chicago *Tribune* gave a revealing talk on press antagonism toward Nixon during the campaign and how this affected the election. Syndicated columnists Constantine Brown and Ralph de Toledano discussed and answered questions on foreign policy and communism.

Among Congressmen who took part in the seminar sessions on practical politics were the four new Republicans mentioned above—John Ashbrook of Ohio; Donald C. Bruce of Indianapolis, Indiana; Peter Garland of Maine and John Rousselot of Los Angeles (Nixon's old district), California. Ashbrook, at 32, is the youngest man in Congress and 33-year-old Rousselot ranks second.

House veterans included Bruce Alger (the lone Texas Republican), Edward Derwinski (R.-Ill.), H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa), Edgar Hiestand (R.-Calif.), and August Johansen (R.-Mich.). Mac Mathieson, of Tucson, Arizona, the Republican who got 45 per cent of the vote in his losing House race with Interior Secretary-designate Stewart Udall, told of the practical experience he gained through mistakes during his campaign and how he planned to rectify them when he runs for the seat in an upcoming special election. The keynote address was delivered by Admiral Ben Moreell (USN, Ret.), board chairman of the Americans for Constitutional Action.

Published weekly at 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50; 3 months $3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address **EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS** on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number, if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $18. Only 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT GEORGE O. FOWLER
ALLAN H. RYSKIND SVEND PETERSEN
Business Manager: W. B. HICKS, JR. *Contributing Editor*: FRANK CHODOROV

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What You Can Do

A REGULAR FEATURE IN YOUR WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Human Events

Vol. XVIII, No. 3 — Section II

January 20, 1961

Electoral College Reform

See Page 40 for summary of electoral reform proposals and what you can do about them.

PROPOSALS for a change in the method of electing our President will flood the new Congress, as a result of the hairline decision in 1960.

The proposals take three forms:

(1) A radical change to direct election by nation-wide popular vote, with abolition of the Electoral College.

(2) Voting for electors, but counting them by districts, with two-at-large votes going to the party getting a statewide plurality.

(3) A compromise plan by which the electoral votes of a state would be divided between the parties on the basis of the popular vote.

Senator Michael J. Mansfield, of Montana, who will be the Majority Leader of the Senate in the new Congress, introduced the amendment for direct popular vote for President and Vice President. This sounds "democratic," but victory would go to the candidate getting a heavy majority of votes in only a few states.

Senator Mundt introduced the proposal for counting votes by electors, each of whom represents a state or congressional district. Victory would go to the candidate winning the largest number of electors—that is, congressional districts. Large pluralities in a few areas could not win an election for a candidate who lacked wide geographical support.

These technical-sounding amendments are actually the two sides of a controversy that goes to the very heart of our political beliefs. Senator Mansfield's proposal is really a counter-revolution against the Constitution, a shift to the direct democracy against which the Founders were trying to protect us. Senator Mundt's proposal is the one most in line with the Constitution.

The issue is critical, because the left-wing pressure groups, like AFL-CIO, Americans for Democratic Action, National Farmers' Union, and many others, have perfected techniques by which they can control large blocs of voters in key areas. They win a huge majority in areas where they work, and they want those votes added up, to offset the choice of large areas where they have not yet acquired influence.

The issue in the debate on the Electoral College is this: How can we reduce or eliminate the power of the mass blocs, like AFL-CIO and the rest, on the choice of a President of the United States?

This fight is going to be extremely bitter, though it may be kept beneath the surface. All the left-wing pressure groups, AFL-CIO, ADA, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Farmers' Union, which control blocs of organized voters, will use every means they possess to have the Mansfield proposal passed, although they will try to do it quietly, without arousing the country to the issues. *Per contra,* the passing of the Mundt amendment for counting electors (singly, not by states) will mean victory for those who are fighting to save us from being transformed into a stream-lined "democracy" under the control of a few "leaders."

TEN YEARS AGO an amendment for electoral reform nearly passed Congress. It was a practical certainty that such an amendment would be ratified by the states. But at the last minute the great power blocs turned on the heat, and demanded defeat of all reforms.

They will do the same thing again unless those who vote as individuals understand the revolutionary nature of the conflict, and the tremendous forces which the managers of the left-wing blocs will throw into the fight.

To understand the problem, we must go back to the Constitution.

The issue foremost in the minds of the Constitutional Convention was how to elect the best man regardless of mass or mob pressures. The Constitution says, in Article II, Section I:

> **"[The] . . . President . . . shall . . . be elected as follows:**
>
> **"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress . . .**
>
> **"The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for two persons, of whom one at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves."**

These votes are certified to the president of the Senate, and counted in the presence of both Houses. The person having a majority of the votes of the electors becomes President.

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1804, the 12th Amendment provided for separate nominations for President and Vice President. No change has been made in the Constitutional provisions since that day, but crucial changes have been made, in fact, by political action.

The Constitutional Convention deliberately chose the method of special electors, because it wanted the choice of President to be made after careful reflection. It provided for the choice of electors by states to preserve the influence of local self-governing areas in the new Federal system. The Convention wanted to make centralization impossible.

Political parties, which did not exist in 1789, soon grew powerful. Early legislative changes provided for direct election of electors by the people rather than the legislature. This was the fruit of Jacksonian democracy. The Jacksonians meant to strengthen the influence of the frontier over the established power of the seaboard, but they also strengthened the tendencies to mass democracy.

The next step was the curious practice of counting the entire popular vote of a state as a unit, and giving the winner all the electoral votes. This policy of "winner take all" meant that the party which won half the votes in a state by a hair-line decision could count all the electoral votes of the state toward a majority. Gradually the states with the largest population, especially those with growing cities, were winning a disproportionately large weight in the final count. For example, in New York State with 45 electoral votes, the candidate whose bare majority would entitle him to 23 electoral votes, now gets the whole 45, or 22 above his popular *vote*. These 22 can match or surpass his opponent's electoral total from several small states.

The result of the winner-take-all policy was to concentrate more and more of the campaign strategy on the winning of the large states. It made nearly impossible the nomination of candidates from the very small states or from the one-party South.

This was bad enough. But with the rise of pressure group politics under Franklin D. Roosevelt, the architects of the mass pressure groups quickly recognized the advantage to them of the winner-take-all rule. By capturing the large cities, they could gain influence over the nomination and election of Presidents out of all proportion to their numbers.

For example, the difference between the two major parties is usually narrow—from one to five per cent. The pressure group strategists recognized that if they had obedient blocs of only 4 to 10 per cent of the voters, they could control the majorities in any state. They could use this advantage to control the nominations of both parties. Let us not waste time arguing that pressure groups like CIO or the Farmers' Union do not control all their members' votes. Of course they do not. But pressure groups today reach the ear of 50 million voters or more. If they change 10 per cent, who wins? They could use this advantage to control the nominations of both parties.

Since 1936 no one who was opposed by the pressure groups (they all work together for candidates and policies which strengthen mass democracy) has been able to get the Presidential or Vice-Presidential nomination in either party.

This sinister technique was worked out by Sidney Hillman in New York City. He built up his obedient bloc of voters through his influence over the CIO local Councils (all local CIO unions) and the "minority" groups. With a small fraction of the entire vote of the city in his pocket, he could persuade both parties to nominate only supporters of left-wing policies, by promising each of them victory through his help. If either party defied him, it went down to certain defeat.

This powerful club, built up out of a fraction of the electorate, regimented by left-wing leadership, proved so effective that it is being systematically applied, state by state, over the country, wherever the pressure groups have a nucleus with which to work.

This strategy of the pressure group leaders has had a powerful influence on the choice of nominees by the Republican party since Alfred M. Landon's defeat in 1936.

The Republicans have not won a Presidential election without New York State since 1876. The type of influences which swing New York often swing other big-city states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, California, Massachusetts and Michigan. Under the winner-take-all method of counting electoral votes, policies and candidates which appeal to these areas are very important. But the Presidential election is still a free choice.

BEGINNING IN 1940, when the pressure groups began to manipulate their marginal blocs on a national scale, they were increasingly able to control candidates, platforms and elections in both national parties because the winner-take-all method of counting votes made their advantage in big-city states decisive.

The pressure blocs built up their power first in the Democratic party. Then they began to persuade hard-core Republicans that they had no choice but to vote Republican and that, by turning to the left, the GOP could win part of the left-wing vote.

This argument was full of holes. The Republicans had another choice: they could stay home, as they did in 1948, or vote only for Congress. Of course, no members of the pressure group voting blocs would be won over by Republican arguments. They would vote Republican only to serve pressure group strategy. Most important of all, so long as this argument prevailed, the Republicans had abandoned the task of the opposition party and had therefore abandoned the two-party system.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republican national leaders did not adopt these arguments because they were thoughtless. The liberal blocs always place their own people in a position of influence over any group they intend to manage, and their "cells" carry on their Trojan Horse tactics from within. They persuade the Republicans that they alone understand "public opinion." They say the voters are "progressive" and will not accept the "dinosaur Republicans" who are opposed to pressure groups.

Most of the Republicans in Congress are not under the influence of the pressure groups, as the Americans for Constitutional Action-Index brought out. We have the spectacle of the Republican national organization going liberal for four months of every fourth year—and wondering why the voters don't believe their protestations. Adlai E. Stevenson (right for once) referred to the "Liberal Hour" every four years when the Republican national party makes its sortie to the left.

In the Democratic party, the pressure groups won their first influence in the big-city states, but the South continues to vote for nominees of the national Democratic party regardless of the difference in basic philosophy. The influence of the Democrats in Congress is the reverse of that of the Republicans. They go along with the left-wing leadership of the national party, while the Republicans in Congress go against it. The influence of Lyndon B. Johnson and Sam Rayburn has kept most Southern members in line, while the center of the Democratic party shifts more and more to the left. In the South, the party is controlled by professionals. In northern Republican districts, the individual voter is more influential. Professionals gain patronage and chairmanships by conformity. The individual voter, who wants nothing, can not be managed.

WE HAVE not finished yet. The pressure groups are not going to stop with control of the big-city states. Why should they? They have been systematically moving into rural areas, especially in the Middle and Far West. By combining the power they exert through extreme left-wing unions, like Mine, Mill and Smelter, through ADA and the Farmers' Union, and the help they get from the National Council of Churches and other religious bodies on issues like Red China and nuclear testing, they are sucessfully transferring their use of a marginal bloc of controlled voters to the rest of the country. Their most spectacular victory has been in the Mountain States.

So we come back to Senator Mansfield. Why did a Senator from Montana, whose four electoral votes give the state a greater ratio of influence in the Electoral College than its popular vote has when counted with the total popular vote from all other states, introduce a popular vote reform? The answer is that Montana, a mining and rural state, is under the political control of the Farmers' Union, the AFL-CIO, the ADA, and all their allied pressure blocs. Senator Mansfield's re-election depends on the support of these pressure blocs. The real interests of his state are not represented in Washington.

Let us repeat. Ten years ago pressure groups defeated proposed amendments for electoral reform which would have weakened the influence of their trained followers on the Presidential election. Today their influence in both parties is much greater. They will fight harder than ever.

The Mundt amendment provides that the vote of the electors will be counted as individuals. That means that all congressional districts will be equal. The blocs cannot use a predominant vote in a few areas to build up a majority in the nation. Their influence will be reduced.

The compromise plan—to vote for electors by states but prorate the electoral votes according to the popular vote for each party—is an attempt to regain for the states the important role the Constitution intended them to have, as guardians of self-government. But today the rise of large cities has changed the problem. The states are still as important as ever. But it is important for state sovereignty itself that the power over election of our President should be centered in the congressional district, the small unit where the pressure groups are at their weakest and where they can be blocked.

It is a mistake to define this as a conflict between "city" and "country." That is not true. It is most important to the individual voters in the cities that they should be able to organize dissent in some congressional districts within the large cities and not let the majority disfranchise them. In a nation being so rapidly urbanized, why should Republicans antagonize the cities? The rural areas are being rapidly brought under the influence of the pressure groups. The cities are even now being stirred by planned publicity campaigns for bitter protests against the long dominance of the rural areas, especially in the state legislatures and in reapportionment. If the Republicans abandon the cities, city voters will be organized as a club to destroy the influence of all small areas—within the cities and outside.

The issue is the individual voter versus the voter who votes in blocs. The mob is the same threat in 1789 as a noisy crowd, or in 1961 as a regimented bloc. In the city and in the country, the strength of the individual lies in strengthening the congressional district as the bastion of the Republic.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 410 First Street, S. E. Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of What You Can Do About "ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles add 1c per copy; for airmail add 2c per copy.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Summary of Electoral Reform Proposals

The following joint resolutions pertaining to abolition or reform of the Electoral College have been introduced in the Senate and referred to the Judiciary Committee (the first one, S. J. Res. 12, is recommended by HUMAN EVENTS):

S. J. Res. 12, by Senator Karl E. Mundt (R.-S.D.), and co-sponsored by Senators Strom Thurmond (D.-S.C.), John L. McClellan (D.-Ark.), Roman L. Hruska (R.-Neb.), Thruston B. Morton (R.-Ky.), and William A. Blakley (D.-Tex.), provides that every voter would vote for two electors at large and for one elector from his elector-district. The elector-districts would be similar but not necessarily identical to the congressional districts. Such elector-districts would be composed of compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitles the state to one Representative in Congress. Once established, such districts would not be altered until another census had been taken. If no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote, a joint session of Congress would choose the winner from among those having the three highest totals of electoral votes; each Senator and Representative would have one vote.

S. J. Res. 1, sponsored by Senator Margaret Chase Smith (R.-Me.) and co-sponsored by Senators J. Glenn Beall (R.-Md.), Dennis Chavez (D.-N.M.) and Wayne L. Morse (D.-Ore.), provides for nomination of candidates for President and for election of such candidates by direct popular vote. This proposal would abolish both the national nominating convention system and the Electoral College. Run-offs are provided in case candidates do not receive majorities in either primaries or general elections.

S. J. Res. 2, by Senator Olin D. Johnston (D.-S.C.), while retaining the Electoral College, would apportion the electoral votes in direct proportion to the popular votes received by the nominees. Electoral votes would be computed to three decimal places. In case of a tie, the winner would be the candidate who received the most popular votes.

S. J. Res. 4, by Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D.-Conn.), would divide the electoral votes according to the percentage of the popular votes. The candidate receiving the most electoral votes would be the winner, if he had at least 40% of them. In case the College fails to elect, the Senate and the House of Representatives, acting jointly, would choose the President from the two candidates with the highest electoral vote. Each Senator and Representative would have one vote, with an absolute majority required for the election.

S. J. Res. 23, by Senator Michael J. Mansfield (D.-Mont.), provides for direct popular election of the President.

S. J. Res. 26, by Senator Gale McGee (D.-Wyo.), would eliminate human electors. Once a candidate had earned an electoral vote, it could not be assigned to someone else.

The Vice President would be elected in the same manner as the President in each of the six proposals.

NOTE: "S. J. Res." stands for "Senate Joint Resolution." One of the above listed measures, which provide for amending the Constitution, would become law only if it passed the Senate and House by two-thirds vote in each body and was ratified by three-fourths of the 50 states (38). The President has no part in the amending process.

What You Can Do About Electoral College Reform

Write your Senators and Representatives telling them that you favor S. J. Res. 12, the Mundt amendment for counting votes for President by congressional districts (electors) and not by any combination of votes, statewide or nationwide, except for the two at large votes. Whether you come from a large state or a small one, a city, a suburb or a rural area, you want the district plan because it protects your right to dissent from political bosses of any stripe.

Also make your position on Electoral College reform known to those Senators who will pass committee and subcommittee judgment on the various proposals. Legislation dealing with constitutional amendments (such as Electoral College reform) will be sent to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Members of the subcommitte, on which there is one Democratic vacancy at the time of this writing, are:

DEMOCRATS

Estes Kefauver (Tenn.), Chairman
James O. Eastland (Miss.)
Thomas J. Dodd (Conn.)

REPUBLICANS

Everett M. Dirksen (Ill.)
Kenneth B. Keating (N. Y.)

Other members of the Judiciary Committee (there are three vacancies, two Democratic and one Republican), of which Senator Eastland is chairman, are:

DEMOCRATS

Olin D. Johnston (S. C.)
John L. McClellan (Ark.)
Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (N. C.)
John A. Carroll (Colo.)
Philip A. Hart (Mich.)

REPUBLICANS

Alexander Wiley (Wisc.)
Roman L. Hruska (Neb.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Parkinson's Law was revealed to the world, business executives and bureaucrats everywhere had the chastening but stimulating experience of facing facts of organizational life. Parkinson's Second Law, like his First (the work load expands to fill the time of all persons employed), is a matter of everyday experience, manifest as soon as stated, as obvious as it is simple. Expenditure rises to meet income. Any individual knows this, but its implications on a governmental scale have never been fully grasped.

This article is extracted from the new book, "The Law and the Profits," by Prof. C. Northcote Parkinson. The contents are copyrighted by the author and reprinted by permission of the publisher, Houghton Mifflin Company. The book may be obtained, for the bookstore price of $3.50, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

Vol. XVIII, No. 3 — Section III **HUMAN EVENTS** January 20, 1961

Parkinson's Second Law

Expenditure Rises To Meet Income

By PROF. C. NORTHCOTE PARKINSON

AN EXTREMELY WEALTHY man underwent an extremely serious operation at the hands of an extremely distinguished surgeon. Ten days afterwards the surgeon asked how his patient was progressing. "Doing fine," said the nurse. "He has already been trying to date Nurse Audrey, a sure sign of convalescence."

"Nurse Audrey?" asked the surgeon quickly. "Is that the blond girl from Illinois?"

"No," the nurse assured him. "Nurse Audrey is the redhead from Missouri."

"In that case," said the surgeon, "the patient needs something to steady his pulse. I shall tell him what the operation cost."

The patient sobered down under this treatment and did some rapid calculations on the back of his temperature chart.

"Your fee of $4000," he finally concluded, "represents the portion I retained from the last $44,500 of my income. To pay you without being worse off would mean earning another $44,500 more than last year; no easy task."

"Well," replied the surgeon, "you know how it is. It is only by charging you that much that I can afford to charge others little or nothing."

"No doubt," said the patient. "But the fee still absorbs $44,500 of my theoretical income—no inconsiderable sum. Might I ask what proportion of the $4000 you will manage to retain?"

It was the surgeon's turn to scribble calculations, as a result of which he concluded that his actual gain, after taxes had been paid, would amount to $800.

"Allow me to observe," said the patient, "that I must therefore earn $44,500 in order to give you $800 for spendable income, the entire balance going to government. Does that strike you as a transaction profitable to either of us?"

"Well, frankly, no," admitted the surgeon. "Put like that, the whole thing is absurd. But what else can we do?"

"First, we can make certain that no one is listening. No one at the keyhole? No federal agent under the bed? No tape recorder in the . . . . ? Are you quite sure that we can keep this strictly to ourselves?"

"Quite sure," the surgeon replied after quickly opening the door and glancing up and down the corridor. "What do you suggest?"

"Come closer so that I can whisper. Why don't I give you a case of Scotch and so call it quits?"

"Not enough," hissed the surgeon, "but if you made it two cases . . . ?"

"Yes?" whispered the patient.

"And lent me your cabin cruiser for three weeks in September . . . . "

"Yes?"

"We might call it a deal!"

"That's fine. And do you know what gave me the idea? I studied Parkinson's Law and realized that excessive taxation has made nonsense of everything!"

"Rubbish, my dear fellow. Parkinson's Law has nothing to do with taxation. It has to do with overstaffing—of which, by the way, this hospital provides some interesting examples. In parasitology, for . . . . "

"Like all medical men, you are out of date. You are referring to Parkinson's First Law. I am referring to his Second Law."

"I must admit that I never heard of it. It concerns taxation, you say?"

"It concerns taxation. It also concerns you. Now, listen . . . listen carefully. Expenditure rises to meet income!"

EXPENDITURE RISES TO MEET INCOME. Parkinson's Second Law, like the first, is a matter of everyday experience, manifest as soon as it is stated, as obvious as it is simple. When the individual has a raise in salary, he and his wife are prone to decide how the additional income is to be spent; so much on an insurance policy, so much to the

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

savings bank, so much in a trust fund for the children. They might just as well save themselves the trouble, for no surplus ever comes into view. The extra salary is silently absorbed, leaving the family barely in credit and often, in fact, with a deficit which has actually increased. Individual expenditure not only rises to meet income but tends to surpass it, and probably always will.

It is less widely recognized that what is true of individuals is also true of governments. Whatever the revenue may be, there will always be the pressing need to spend it. But between governments and individuals there is this vital difference, that the government rarely pauses even to consider what its income is. Were any of us to adopt the methods of public finance in our private affairs, we should ignore the total of our income and consider only what we should like to spend. We might decide on a second car, an extension of the home, a motor launch as well as a yacht, a country place and a long holiday in Bermuda. All these, we should tell each other, are essential. It would remain only to adjust our income to cover these bare necessities; and if we economize at all, it will be in the matters of taxation.

A government, by contrast, which applied the methods of individual finance to public expenditure would begin by attempting to estimate what its actual revenue should be. Given so much to spend, how much should be allocated to what? A federal government which decided upon this novel approach to the subject would be responsible for a revolution in public finance. It is the chief object of this book to suggest that such a revolution, of which we have seen some hint in California, is now generally overdue.

Governmental as opposed to individual income is historically linked with the incidence of war. In all systems of revenue there has always been provision for the temporary expenses of conflict. During a time of emergency, with our interests, our beliefs, our pride or even our existence at stake, we agree to pay almost anything as the price of victory. The war ends and with it the temporary expenses which everyone has seen to be more or less inevitable. In theory the revenue should fall to something like its previous level. In practice it seldom does. While the governmental income remains almost at its wartime level, peacetime expenditure rises to meet it. In times past the action of this law was slightly restrained, to be sure, by two considerations which no longer apply. In the first place, it was usually felt that taxes had to be reduced somewhat in time of peace in order to allow for their being raised again in time of war. During a century, however, when each successive war is judged to be the last, this theory finds no further support. In the second place, there are types of extravagance which yield only a diminishing return. To the provision of banquets and the enjoyment of dancing girls there is (eventually) a physical limit. The same is not true, unfortunately, of departmental and technical luxuriance. Economic and cultural advisers can multiply beyond the point at which concubines might be thought a bore; beyond the point even at which they might be thought unbearable. Financially as well as aesthetically, the situation has become infinitely worse.

IN COUNTRIES like Britain and the United States the initiative in public finance comes from subdepartments of government which decide each year on their needs for the year that is to come. After allowing for present costs and future developments the experienced civil servant adds 10 per cent to the total, assuming (not always correctly) that his bid will be challenged at some stage by the financial branch. Assuming, however, that the expectant wrangle takes place, the added 10 per cent is deleted at the departmental level when the combined estimate comes to be drawn up. To this estimate the head of the department adds 10 per cent again, assuming (not always correctly) that his bid will be challenged by the Treasury. After the expected dispute, the revised estimate is laid before the responsible Minister, in England the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who consolidates all the departmental demands in a grand total and decides how the revenue can be made to equal the expenditure. With the agreement of his colleagues, he presents the nation with the bill. Here is the sum total of what the government needs, and these are the taxes which the people will have to pay.

But what, it will be asked, of the safeguards? Are not the accounts and estimates laid before the people's representatives? Is there no Treasury Department to act as watchdog over the public purse? Are there no regulations framed to check extravagance and waste? All these safeguards undoubtedly exist. That they are futile is manifest from the known results. The reasons for their futility are less obvious, however, and are perhaps worth investigating, both as curious in themselves and as affording the clue to possible improvement. Briefly, the answer is that the accounts are meaningless, the Treasury ineffective and the regulations so contrived as to make economy not so much difficult as impossible.

DEVISED ORIGINALLY to guard the till, the public form of accounting dates from a period before bookkeeping by double entry was generally known except among non-conformists like Defoe. It dates, moreover, from an age when few gentlemen knew even the arabic numerals, the clock face in the stable yard showing only the Roman figures which the classically educated might be expected to understand. The result is that these public accounts, not of the latest pattern even in 1689, are now beginning to verge on the obsolete. They were revised, it is true, as a result of an inquiry held in 1828-29, but the minority report of the professional accountant was set aside in favor of the civil servants' recommendations; these were against double entry and left untouched the previous confusion between liabilities and assets, between capital and current. In 1904 Mr. Thomas Gibson Bowles, M.P., could therefore describe the national accounts as "unsystematic, unscientific, complicated, and so presented as to conceal and even to falsify the facts." In 1957 Mr. John Applebey remarked that those responsible for the public accounts seem to confuse themselves as well as everyone else.

It is fair to conclude, in short, that the British public accounts are not quite in line with current methods of accountancy. As a means of control, as a system of imparting information, they are scarcely worth the paper they are printed on. Accounts which would disgrace and discredit a third-rate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dog-racing company are solemnly presented each year to the nation, and often presented by a businessman who ought to and does know better. So far from being improved in form, these accounts have become more complex and muddled as the sums involved have proliferated and swollen. They are not true and they do not balance. It is the business of the accountant to give the facts of the financial position in the language of business, which is money. In that language he is to tell the truth and the whole truth. But those who present accounts to the nation do nothing of the kind. They present only a picture of archaic and dignified confusion.

And what of the Treasury, that guardian of the public weal? The accepted principle is that new expenditure is watched by the Treasury, old expenditure by the departments themselves. But what sort of financial control is this? The division of responsibility is meaningless, for the problem of true economy is one and indivisible. Under such a system the extra clerk is demanded while the surplus clerk is retained. No office is ever declared redundant for fear that it should again be wanted and that its revival would mean a new approach to the Treasury. Nor would the surrender of an established post in Department A make it any easier to establish a different post in Department B, the two problems being considered in fact by separate authorities and as things totally unrelated to each other.

Such a practice can lead only to an irresponsible attitude among those forbidden to regard the problem as a whole. And experience suggests that grown men treated as children can behave in a very childish way.

AS FOR THE REGULATIONS imposed on the official, all they do is to add rigidity to waste. The whole system of appropriations is convenient only for cash accounting and useless for purposes of control. The departmental appropriation does not represent, to begin with, the cost of the department to which it relates. The Army Vote excludes stationery, for that is supplied by H. M. Stationery Office; the Stationery Office Vote excludes buildings (because these belong to the Office of Works) and so it goes on. Nor does the appropriation correspond to what is being done. Thus, the Navy's Votes are serialized from 1 (for pay) to 15 (for additional married quarters), with separate votes for such things as shipbuilding, armaments and the Admiralty Office.

Similarly, the Army Account is serialized into Votes: No. 1 for Pay, 7 for Supplies, 9 for Warlike Stores, and so forth. But neither the Navy nor the Army is organized like that. The Navy is organized into units afloat and ashore. The Army is organized in battalions, batteries, depots and schools, for which individually no cost is shown. All that the system ensures is that money voted for vehicles should not be spent on weapons. But what if it were? And what is the point of the distinction? The Legislature should not concern itself with that. What the faithful lawmakers might more usefully watch is the relative cost of administration and troops. How many extra battalions might be maintained for the sum spent on the finance branch of the War Office? Which are we more likely to need in an emergency — minute sheets or bayonets, ledgers or guns? That is a question of policy whereas the total allocation for uniform clothing is almost solely a matter for the expert. The present rigidity is merely a waste of effort, money and time, serving no useful purpose of any kind.

So much for the official safeguards. In the light of their failure, all that remains to check extravagance is the press and the public. It might be thought that these would be effective, the press having no great love for bureaucracy and the body of taxpayers having a direct interest in the economical handling of their affairs. Why should press and public prove helpless where their own interests are so vitally concerned? The answer to that question is that true economy cannot be imposed on an organization from outside; it must begin at the center. From time to time the press does take up the cry of official extravagance, publishing details of apparent waste which the departments concerned are often in a position to contradict. More often the attacks are simply ignored, the civil servants well knowing that the newspapers will turn to something else in a few days time. Suppose, however, that the outcry leads to questions in the House and that proof is forthcoming of some of the allegations made, what is the result? The inevitable sequel is the appointment of an investigating committee, a device intended to postpone the business until after the next election.

Let us suppose that naval dockyards are the subject of inquiry and that the investigators descend upon each in turn. The members include retired admirals and practicing engineers who are far from ignorant of the matter in hand. They hear evidence. They ask searching questions: "What are these fellows suppose to be doing?" "What is all this junk?" "How do you dispose of the clinker and wood shavings?" "Why pay so many people to do so little?" But they soon observe a phenomenon which is best explained in terms of zoology. In the presence of wolves, sheep are said to form a tight bunch with horns outward and the weakest in the center. Civil servants do the same.

Faced by a common danger, they take up that formation, yielding nothing, denying everything, concealing all. This is a well-known fact of biology and one against which the committee members must struggle in vain. Their report, when eventually printed, might just as well be placed in the toilet. Whatever happens to it, the matter is allowed to drop.

The ordinary taxpayer is often in a better position to know about waste in administration than either the politician or the journalist. For one thing, he may himself be employed in the dockyard. It is theoretically his interest as well as his duty to come forward and denounce extravagance when he sees it. He does nothing of the kind, and that for two distinct reasons. In the first place he stands to gain nothing but unpopularity and abuse, being likely to be regarded as at best a crank, at worst a spy. In the second place, he knows perfectly well that the money saved in one direction will certainly be wasted in another. Nothing he can do will reduce the tax he has to pay. So he wisely decides to say nothing and keep the good opinion of his neighbors.

What is to be done? The modern instinct is to frame new regulations and laws, of which there are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already more than enough. The better plan, less fashionable today, is to remotivate the people actually concerned, penalizing the extravagance we now reward and rewarding the economy we now penalize. As a first step toward redirecting the flood, we need to reverse the whole process of government finance. Ministers should not begin by ascertaining what the departments need. They should begin by asking what the country can afford to spend. We do not base our personal budget on what our past extravagances have taught us to like but on the income we can fairly expect to receive. We do not, in short, plan to spend what we have not got.

The same principle should apply to public as it does to individual finance. The first question to decide is the ratio between the revenue and the gross national product. What proportion of the national income should the government demand? What proportion of the individual's income can the government safely take? And what happens when the proportion is exceeded? Economists (with one notable exception) have fought shy of this problem, allowing it to be assumed that, where government expenditure is concerned, the sky is the limit. It is one aim of this book to suggest that there are other and lower limits; a limit beyond which taxation is undesirable, a limit beyond which it is dangerous and a limit (finally) beyond which it is fatal. And these limits are clearly indicated by both economic theory and historical fact.

IN THE LIGHT of these known dangers, it is for the Cabinet to decide upon the ratio between government expenditure and gross national product. That decision taken, there is a total fixed for the revenue, a total within which the Ministries have to work. It is for the Cabinet again to decide upon the distribution of this total between the departments. To individual departmental heads would fall the responsibility of subdividing departmental allocations between the various branches and units. No department under this system would be asked to submit an estimate. It would be told, instead, to keep within a total. All that would concern the Legislature would be the gross expenditure and its allocation to Departments. Lawmakers need not be asked to vote on the relative amounts to be spent on gasoline and grease, floor polish and boots. They can fairly compare the value for money given by the Air Force or the British Council, by Education or by Health. For purposes of control, they need no more than that by way of forecast, together with real accounts of expenditure in the past—such accounts as they have never yet been allowed to see.

The obvious advantage of the system here described is that a limit is placed on expenditure. An advantage as important, if less obvious, is that the expenditure becomes flexible within each Ministry, Department, subdepartment and unit. The officials themselves are thus made responsible for economy, their success or failure becoming instantly apparent from the accounts of the following year. It is the executive officers, and they alone, who know where economies can safely be made. Once they understand that the development they want in one direction is conditional on their economizing in another direction, the rest can safely be left to them; provided that promotion goes first to the man who shows where the money can be saved. Yet another advantage, still less obvious at first sight, would be the elimination of Treasury supervision with all its evils of divided control, inefficiency and waste. In place of distrustful interference, the public official would know only the strong leash of account and audit. He would be compelled to accept responsibility, free to display initiative and forced to recognize that cost and value are but different aspects of the same idea.

ONCE THE DECISION has been made to approach the financial problem from the right direction, it would remain only to enlist public aid in the prevention of waste. For this purpose the first need is for an independent tribunal to which all proposals for saving money could be submitted, a body of, say, three, to include a government representative. This tribunal would hear representations from the public and from the departments affected and would decide finally whether each suggested economy were feasible or not. Each decision in favor of an economy would lead to an executive order to the department concerned, reducing its future allocation by the amount to be saved. It would be the further function of the tribunal to reward each successful applicant by the remission of his income tax proportionally to the amount of the saving. There should also be provision to ensure that all sums saved should go, not to another department, nor to the Treasury, but solely to the reduction of the National debt. The last function of the tribunal would be to recommend for the highest honors the citizens whose suggestions had resulted in the greatest economies, as also the civil servants who had been most successful in reducing needless expenditure. A minor revolution would date from the day when officials came to realize that reputation is more readily to be won by saving money than by spending it.

It is not to be supposed that the reform of the national finances would be unopposed. In this field of administration the reformer will be faced, inevitably, by a closed phalanx of civil servants representing one of the strongest vested interests in the world. Their opposition, though passive, will be formidable. To all proposals for a proper system of accounts they will reply with a pitying smile that it was tried once at the War Office, found wasteful and long ago abandoned. They will then retire behind a smoke screen of technical mysteries, muttering finally that public finance is a more complex matter than is generally realized. Figures cannot lie but liars can figure.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 410 First Street, S. E. Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "PARKINSON'S SECOND LAW" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles add 1c per copy; for airmail add 2c per copy.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED